




Docket No.: 252192US-2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER
(703) 413-3000
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

SURINDER SACHAR
(703) 413-3000
SSACHAR@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/829,299
Applicants: Minoru TAKAYA, et al.
Filing Date: April 22, 2004
For: ELECTRONIC COMPONENT AND PROCESS FOR
MANUFACTURING THE SAME
Group Art Unit: 1771
Examiner: GOFMAN, A.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599


Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423



DOCKET NO: 252192US-2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

MINORU TAKAYA ET AL.

SERIAL NO.: 10/829,299

FILED: APRIL 22, 2004

FOR: ELECTRONIC COMPONENT AND PROCESS
FOR MANUFACTURING THE SAME

:

:

:

:

EXAMINER: GOFMAN, A.

GROUP ART UNIT: 1771

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of December 21, 2005, Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, Claims 1-9.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.

M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/SNS/des

I:\ATTY\SNS\255\252192\252192US.REST.RESP.DOC